REMARKS

The Office action dated June 15, 2006 has been carefully considered. Claims 1, 3-10 and 12-25 are active in this application. Further examination and reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 3-10 and 12-25 are respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 6-10, 12-13, and 15-255 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall et al. in view of Williams et al. is respectfully traversed. However, in order to further the prosecution of this application, claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended in order to further distinguish the claims from the cited art.

Claims 1, 10 and 19 now recite access rights "_as defined by one or more access macro codes comprising (an) the access message(s)." The cited art maintains data compilations of access rights matched with users in a database such as subscriber management system 110 of Marshall as indicated by paragraphs 0053 and 0054 as cited in the Office action. Williams does not address this matter. Before access is allowed, a user access must be verified by subscriber management system 110. This necessarily means that customer access/password data must be maintained centrally by subscriber management system 110. Further, for Marshall, this establishes that access is not defined by an access message or within a macro code comprising an access messages. An unwieldy system therefore results which is not well-suited for providing service reports for the users with which applicants' claims 1, 10 and 19 are concerned - particularly those involving wireless communications as may be found involving truck or fleet management. The system defined by claims 1, 10, and 19 does not require verification by a subscriber management system 110 since the access rights are "defined by the one or more access macro codes." Once the codes are presented, which within themselves define access rights, the system may grant or deny access to requested service information. This permits the advantage of allowing access rights to be defined locally and updated globally while needing only the current definition of the access message to determine access for a user, thereby dispensing with any requirement to maintain and match user access information with stored user rights/passwords centrally. Having to do otherwise, likely places a heavy burden upon maintaining a central access database particularly with a system involving constantly changing access information. Marshall with Williams fails to teach, suggest or make obvious claims 1, 10 and 19. It is

therefore submitted that claims 1, 10, and 19 have been shown to be patentably distinguishable, with the forgoing advantages discussed herein, from the cited art, particularly Marshall in view of Williams. Claims dependent from 1, 10, and 19 recite limitations in addition thereto and are likewise submitted as being patentably distinguishable over the cited art including Marshall with Williams.

The rejection of claims 5 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall et al. in view of Kaplan et al. is respectfully traversed. Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 14 depends from claim 10. In view of the noted limitation to claims 1 and 10, it is submitted that claims 5 and 14 are patentably distinct from any combination of Marshall with Kaplan since Marshall and any combination of Marshall and Kaplan fail to teach, suggest or make obvious applicants' invention as claimed.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept 15, 2006

By: _Richard A Bachand_
Richard A. Bachand
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 25,107

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: 858) 845-8503
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502